

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/680,473	10/07/2003	Laszlo T. Nemeth	108089	5206	
23490 7:	590 03/23/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
JOHN G TOLOMEI, PATENT DEPARTMENT			TOOMER, CEPHIA D		
UOP LLC 25 EAST ALG	ONQUIN ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P O BOX 5017	•		1714		
DES PLAINES	s, IL 60017-5017		DATE MAILED: 03/23/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			V	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/680,473	NEMETH ET AL.	H ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Cephia D. Toomer	1714		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
Period for Reply	VIOLET TO EVENE AMOUTH	(O) OD TUUDTY (OO) DAYO		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind  It will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
,	is action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application	n.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,9-12 and 19</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) <u>5,7 and 13-18</u> is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	nts have been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in Applicat	ion No		
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the price</li></ol>	ority documents have been receiv	ed in this National Stage		
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not receive	ed.		
Attachment(s)	. 🗖			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D			
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>		Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/680,473 Page 2

Art Unit: 1714

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Specification

1. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 is rejected because the term "high" is a relative term that does not have a comparative value.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Noveon.

Noveon teaches a solid fuel gel comprising 0.5% Carbopol EZ-3 (polyacrylilc compound), 24% water and 75% methanol (see abstract in its entirety).

Art Unit: 1714

Accordingly, Noveon teaching all the limitations of the claims anticipates the claims.

6. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Monick (US 3,183,068).

Monick teaches fuel gels comprising 60-95% alcohol (methanol or ethanol), 2-6% of a gelling agent (carboxy vinyl polymers, copolymers of maleic anhydride with olefinic type material, etc)(see col. 1, lines 8-11,64-69; col.2, lines 1-7;col. 3, lines 25-40). The fuel also contains metal salts (see col. 3, lines 14-19).

Accordingly, Monick teaching all the limitations of the claims anticipates the claims.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 1, 9-12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finkelshtain (US 6,554,877).

Finkelshtain teaches fuel compositions for fuel cells comprising metal oxygenates such as sodium bis (2-methoxyethoxy) dihydridaluminate (see abstract; col. 4, lines 39-44) and a metal hydride such as Li, Na, K hydrides (see col. 4, lines 39-44). The composition contains the electrolyte, KOH (see col. 5, lines 46-47).

Application/Control Number: 10/680,473

Art Unit: 1714

Finkelshtain teaches the limitations of the claims other than the differences that are discussed below.

Page 4

Finkelshtain fails to teach that the fuel is in solid form. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the composition as a solid fuel in order to produce a fuel that is easier to handle and will not flow out of the openings in the fuel cell.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noveon.

Noveon has been discussed above. Noveon fails to teach the claimed amount of acrylic polymer. However, it would have been obvious it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the proportions of the acrylic polymer through routine experimentation for best results. As to optimization results, a patent will not be granted based upon the optimization of result effective variables when the optimization is obtained through routine experimentation unless there is a showing of unexpected results which properly rebuts the *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990), and *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

10. Claims 5, 7 and 13-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/680,473 Page 5

Art Unit: 1714

The prior art fails to teach the combination of acetaldehyde and acrylic polymer or solid antioxidant, solid catalyst or gelled oxygenate with the claimed metal oxygenates.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cephia D. Toomer

Application/Control Number: 10/680,473

Art Unit: 1714

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714 Page 6

10680473\031906